

USDC SDNY
 DOCUMENT
 ELECTRONICALLY FILED
 DOC#
 DATE FILED: 3/11/2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X	
JENNIFER BRADLEY,	:
	:
Plaintiff,	:
	:
- against -	:
	:
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,	:
	:
Defendant.	:
	X

Ramos, D.J.:

Jennifer Bradley (“Plaintiff” or “Bradley”), proceeding *pro se*, brought this action appealing the denial of her applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. On June 10, 2013, the Honorable Richard J. Sullivan, to whom this case was originally assigned, referred the case to Magistrate Judge Henry Pitman. Doc. 18.¹ On July 12, 2013, the Commissioner of Social Security filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Doc. 19. On July 31, 2014, Judge Pitman issued the Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Commissioner’s motion for judgment on the pleadings be granted and notifying Bradley that she had fourteen days from service of the Report and Recommendation to file written objections. Doc. 23. No objection to the Report has been filed.

I. Standard of Review

A district court reviewing a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Parties may raise “specific,” “written” objections to the report and recommendation “[w]ithin fourteen days after being served with a copy.” *Id.*; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court reviews *de novo* those portions of the report and

¹ On July 22, 2013, this case was reassigned to this Court.

recommendation to which timely and specific objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile* (95-CR-1074), 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). The district court may adopt those parts of the report and recommendation to which no party has timely objected, provided no clear error is apparent from the face of the record. *Lewis v. Zon*, 573 F. Supp. 2d 804, 811 (S.D.N.Y. 2008). The district court will also review the report and recommendation for clear error where a party's objections are "merely perfunctory responses" argued in an attempt to "engage the district court in a rehashing of the same arguments set forth in the original petition." *Ortiz v. Barkley*, 558 F. Supp. 2d 444, 451 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

II. Discussion

Despite Plaintiff's failure to object to the Report, the Court has reviewed Judge Pitman's thorough and well-reasoned Report and finds no error, clear or otherwise. The Court therefore adopts Judge Pitman's recommendation to grant Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings for the reasons stated in the Report.

For the reasons set forth above, Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings is GRANTED. The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motion, Doc. 19, mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff, and to close the case.

Furthermore, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith; therefore, *in forma pauperis* status is denied for purposes of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

It is SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 11, 2015
New York, New York


Edgardo Ramos, U.S.D.J.